| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Rachel S. Doughty (Cal. Bar No. 255904) Jennifer Rae Lovko (Cal. Bar No. 208855) GREENFIRE LAW, PC 2478 Adeline Street, Suite A Berkeley, CA 94703 Ph/Fax: (510) 900-9502 Email: rdoughty@greenfirelaw.com rlovko@greenfirelaw.com Attorneys for Petitioners Save Our Forest Associa | ation, Inc. |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | EASTERN DIVISION | |
| 11 | SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION, INC. | Case No.: 5:24-cv-01336-JGB-DTB |
| 12 | Plaintiffs, | [PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF |
| 13 | VS. | SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION, INC.'s MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE RELATED CASES PURSUANT TO FED. |
| 14 | U.S. FOREST SERVICE, an agency of the U.S. | R. CIV. P. § 42(a) |
| 15 | Department of Agriculture, and MICHAEL NOBLES, in his official capacity as Acting | Hearing Date: February 10, 2025 |
| 16 17 | District Ranger for the San Bernardino National Forest, | Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m. Courtroom: 1 |
| | | Judge: Hon. Jesus G. Bernal Action Filed: June 25, 2024 |
| 18 | Defendants. | |
| 19 | BLUETRITON BRANDS, INC. | Case No.: 2:24-cv-09720-JGB-DTB |
| 20 | Plaintiffs, | |
| 21 | VS. | Action Filed: August 6, 2024 Assigned to: Hon. Jesus G. Bernal |
| 22 | UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, an | |
| 23 | agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, | |
| 24 | and MICHAEL NOBLES, in his official capacity as Acting District Ranger for the San | |
| 25 | Bernardino National Forest, | |
| 26 | D. f 1 4 | |
| 27 | Defendants. | |
| 28 | | :1- |

| 1 | The Court has fully considered the Motion to Consolidate Related Cases filed by Plaintiff | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | SAVE OUR FOREST ASSOCIATION, INC. ("SOFA") and any response and reply thereto. This | |
| 3 | Court has broad discretion in determining whether consolidation is practical. Atlantic States Legal | |
| 4 | Foundation Inc. v. Koch Refining Co., 681 F. Supp 609, 615 (D. Minn. 1988). In exercising this | |
| 5 | discretion, this Court has weighed both the time and effort consolidation would save with any | |
| 6 | inconvenience or delay it would cause. Hendrix v. Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., 776 F.2d 1492, 1495 | |
| 7 | (11th Cir. 1985); Huene v. United States, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984). See also Kramer v. | |
| 8 | Boeing Co., 134 F.R.D. 256 (D. Minn. 1991). | |
| 9 | Here, consolidation offers efficiency and convenience in these matters. A consolidated | |
| 10 | proceeding will save time and avoid unnecessary costs to all parties and this Court. | |
| 11 | Accordingly, good cause having been shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the two | |
| 12 | actions be consolidated into one proceeding. | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Dated: By: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE | |
| 15 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | - 2 - | |